Federal Energy Hearings 1976

Federal Energy Hearings

Public Hearings

Fairbanks

1976

* * FAIRBANKS SPEAKERS * *

	NAME	PAGE
1)	COOK, Mr.	169
2)	STONOROV, MS.	175
3)	KAWALSKI, Mr.	188
4)	WALTON, Mrs.	193
5)	DEACON, Albert	200
6)	REES, Chuck	203
7)	FINNEGAN, Patrick	211
8)	BREWER, Max	216
9)	MESSER, Jim	228
10)	BEISTLINE Dr. E.	230
111	CDANDALL AGE	238

* *FAIRBANKS, ALASKA* *

THURSDAY, APRIL 8th

CHAIRMAN JACK B. ROBERTSON presiding.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to say a few opening words about this conference.

As you know, we have been holding public hearings concerning Petroleum Reserve No. 4. The first hearing was held in Anchorage yesterday, and extended over until today, and then there is a formal hearing to be held in Barrow on the 10th, which is Saturday.

Because of the desire of citizens here in Fairbanks to also input to our study, we are denominating this as a conference as distinct from a public hearing — because if we call it a public hearing we have to publish it in the Federal Register, and I haven't published it in the Federal Register — and then I'm in trouble. So, I want the record to show that this is a conference.

I am Jack B. Robertson, I am the Regional Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration, Federal Region X, based in Seattle. I have with me today at my left Dr. Robert Davies - he is Director of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Office, Federal Energy Administration, Washington, D.C.

Mext to him is Dick LeDesquit, District Manager of the Bureau of Land Management Fairbanks; next to him is

24

25

Lieutenant Commander Terrance Wood, Officer in Charge, NPR #4, Department of Navv, and across from him is Mr. George Gryc, Regional Geologist, Western Region, United States Geological Survey.

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which became law on the 22nd of December required that the administrator of the Federal Energy Administration, and I will quote from it, "Shall, in cooperation and consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Interior, develop and submit to the Congress within 180 days after the day of enactment of this act, a written report recommending procedures for exploration development, and production of Naval Petroleum Reserve #4. This report shall include recommendations for protecting the economic social environmental interests of Alaska Natives residing within the Petroleum Reserve #4, and analysis of arrangements which provide for one, participation by private industry and private capital; and, two, leasing to private industry.

The Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of Interior shall cooperate totally with one another and with the Federal Energy Administration administrator.

The Secretary of the Navy shall provide to the Administrator and the Secretary of Interior, all relevant

data on the Petroleum Reserve #4, in order to assist the Federal Energy Administration in preparation of such reports." (reading from document).

I would like to tell you some of the things we are looking for.

We are looking for basic information and data with respect to the Petroleum reserve, and the information we seek will include the estimate of undiscovered and recoverable resources, data and geologic and geophysical aspects of the reserves and climatic and meteorological data.

We would also appreciate any information on the existing proposed transportation networks and corridors.

We are interested in information on existing labor base and the cost of materials.

We are also interested in the scope of alternative exploration programs necessary to explore the petroleum reserve.

Here we seek information to help us develop a number of alternative programs which would reflect varying rates of exploration, as well as potential exploratory zones.

We are interested in all alternate and development and production efforts needed to bring NPR #4 into

production at the earliest time, and maximize the present value of reserve.

Now, the Federal Fnergy Administration plans to define three alternative developments, and production scenario is based on small, medium and large findings of oil.

In order to define these scenarios, we are interested in estimates of possible resource and identification of existing and potential constraints on such development.

We are also looking for alternative means of achieving government exploration goals for NPR #4. Here we seek data on a range of alternative -- institutional arrangements and distribution costs in risk and benefits of each.

This includes possible participation by private industry, government or a combination of both.

And finally, we are interested in looking into a social economic environmental impact of NPR exploration development and production in the State of Alaska, and, also, on the Alaska Natives.

We are interested in your views that will focus on specific environmental problems and specific recommendations to immediarate any adverse impact.

Now, with that as an introduction, I would be

interested in what you have to tell us on this subject, what advice you have for us, and with that I will call the first speaker that is registered, Mr. Michael T. Cook, representing the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce, do I have that right.

Come forth and sit in one of these chairs and give us the benefit of your advice.

MR. COOK:

Well, since I am president of the Fairbanks Chamber, I should and will say I am glad to see you in Fairbanks, and have a chance to talk to you.

As you probably heard, we were hurt when he heard that there were no public hearings planned for Fairbanks, and fortunately you were able to show up here, and I think that is going to be useful for us and to you.

There are probably three topics that I should say something about. One of them is that when you are dealing with exploring in the north, be sure that you remember that Fairbanks consideres itself, and is, and has been, the service and supply center for the oilfields and Prudhoe, so we are experienced and have considerable facilities that I think could be made use of.

In the way of transportation, there is the railroad

that ends here, and anything that needs to be shipped up could be hauled that way.

There are trucking firms, air taxis, helicopter services, equipment supply houses and a lot of personnel here, and being made good use of.

Remember that as the construction of the oil pipeline grinds down, some of these facilities will be even more available while you are working

Fairbanks people will be interested in the work. We have had a lot of new people move here during the oil pipeline construction, and the good ones we would like to see stay, and more employment for them, the better off we will be.

on PET #4.

I think you will find that we are interested in whatever we could do to help in the way of service and supply aspect of the exploration up there.

Another area that you will find that Fairbanks is concerned about is the availability of gas and oil for use in Alaska.

We know that some of the gas in that field is being used now by the Natives, and should continue to be.

If there are stategies that you could use during your exploration to make gas available to others in the north who want it, early on, that would probably

2			Whatever that term is.
3			What is going to happen to that road?
4	MR.	COOK:	
5			I would like to think that it would be as open to
6			traffic as is practical, to the general public, and
7			if there is good reason for using it.
8			It would seem to me that it would be a facility
9			that you would be interested in wanting to use to
10			economically explore NPR #4. If something like
11			that is not available, I think you would find your
12			job more difficult than if it were closed.
13			My expectation is that that road will be open and
14			available for use, and that you could make good use
15			of it.
16	MR.	DAVIES	· :
17			Of course, the road does not go to PET #4.
18	MR.	COOK:	
19			No. It would be a matter of from our standpoint,
20		•	if it were lengthened into PET #4, my feeling is,
21			that's fine. I don't know whether you would find
22			people that would resist that. I suspect that you
23			would find that some would resist that.
24			Whether or not you would see yourself being able to,
25			more economically transport into the north by
l			*

MR. DAVIES:

using the road and perhaps flying from Deadhorse, 1 2 that, to me, might be a possibility for you. 3 MR. GRYC: Just what is the procedure, or how is it determined 4 5 whether that road is going to stay open or not? MR. COOK: 6 Let's see, who is here that is more of an expert 7 8 than I am. 9 Let me see how I do with it. MRS. WALTON: 10 11 We'll correct you if you are wrong. 12 MR. COOK: 13 My expectation would be that -- the State will develop a position that has to be taken sometime 14 15 in 1977, when Alyeska is finished. The more pressure that is put on to use the road constructively 16 17 for things like developing resources of the type 18 that Alaskans see as good development. You see, oil and gas is good development for this 19 20 state, but one thing is, it has a potential of 21 supplying energy. For another thing, it generally 22 employs high paid people, and unless you employ 23 high paid people, you can't afford to live in Alaska, and we, the people, are placed in good 24 25 employment.

1		Another thing is that we know that people from the
2		other states would want to come up to a less
3		populated area. They do they want to live here,
4		we want to be able to provide them with a comfortable
5		place.
6		So that road, economically to Fairbanks to
7		Fairbanks, it is very important economically. To
8		oil exploration and development, it is very
9		important economically.
10		As these things are seen, I think that the State
11		will look for ways to keep that road open,
12		especially if they could see the fuel tax revenues
13		and that are going to be enough to offset a good
14		part of the maintenance, and I think you will find
15		that when the decision time comes, that there will
16		be that the State will find that they want to
17		keep it open, and for various reasons, they have to.
18	MR. DAVIES	· •
19		Is there a very strong public stand one way or the
20		other?
21	MR. COOK:	
22		There is strong public stand both ways.
23	MR. DAVIES	· •
24		Is there a concensus, or was it divided?
25		

1	MR. COOK	
2		From my standpoint, the only practical concensus is
3	`	to keep it open, but you will find that there is not
4		a concensus. It creates a lot of conversation.
5		I think that the thing is weighted, really, towards
6		most people see that if we want to live the way we
7		want to live, some of these things have to be done,
8		whether we like it or not. So, I think it will
9		be open.
10		If you need it, that is one more good reason to
11		keep it open.
12	MR. ROBE	RTSON:
13		Any other questions from the panel?
14		I wonder if somebody else in the audience that knows
15 ·		about the road, and has views on that road, could
16		share those views with us.
17		Yes, could you stand and give your name?
18	MS. STO	NOROV:
19		I'm from the Alaska Conservation Society.
20	MR. ROBE	RTSON:
21		Will you speak next?
22	MS. STO	NOROV:
23		Yeah. I am the executive secretary of the Alaska
24		Conservation Society, which is a statewide organiza-
25		tion with a thousand members and eight chapters

1		would neip us if you would summarize what the
2		statement is and then give copies to Mr. Don Jean
3		sitting there, and we will have copies then made
4		for all the people.
5	MS. STONOR	OV:
6		I have several copies of it here.
7	MR. ROBERT	SON:
8		Virginia Dow, did she
9	MS. STONOR	ov:
10		Yeah, she read it yesterday, because we didn't know
11		you were going to have a hearing here.
12		The PET the haul road, I have one copy of that.
13		It's quite long. Our position, very briefly, has
14		been that I'll just read a short part of it, if
15		you want me to do that.
16	MR. ROBERT	SON:
17		Okay.
18	MS. STONOR	ov:
19		The Alaska Conservation Society has had a continuing
20		deep interest in the proper management of all Alaskan
21		lands, including lands of Northern Alaska adjacent

23

24

25

177

to or effected by the TransAlaska Oil Pipeline and

We are concerned that all of the values, Alaska and

the rest of the U. S. proceed in this great northern

haul road corridor.

hitherland be understood and considered with comprehensive sensitivity.

We are concerned that no action, based on issues of narrow scope and expedience be taken that would fort the broad public interest.

The State should not let the Bureau of Land

Management and the small number of bus companies

badger it into a premature decision on the pretext

of the necessity for such a decision in order to

adequately plan for use of the corridor, which has

not yet been determined to be in the public interest.

(reading from document).

This was written to be read at the recent Alaska
Growth Policy Council Hearings on the haul road.

In September 1974 the Society participated as a
formal protestant in a prehearing conference before
the Alaska Transportation Commission in the matter
of requests from bus companies for certificates of
convenience and necessity to permit them to carry
tourists over the haul road.

At the time the ATC accepted memos of law with respect to whether or not the ATC had jurisdiction over the road, and its ability to grant the permit. We are questioning whether this had been resolved, and whether the state has jurisdiction over the road

at this point.

In addition to participating before the Alaska
Transportation Commission, the Society has also
attending briefings by the Bureau of Land Management
by invitation on its plans for the tax corridor.

In a letter to the Bureau of Land Management the
Society expressed dismay at the BLM's proposed
plan which prematurely assumed that the road would
be open to the public.

The plan incorporated provisions for industrial, commercial and residential uses north of the Yukon, which we felt were clearly inappropriate.

The letter expressed sympathy with the BLM's attempts to plan ahead for the corridor, but stated that the Society felt that the process at that time was conducted behind closed doors, and had not involved other state and federal agencies with responsibities in that area, nor did the BLM comply with NEPA, in that they did not, at that time, propose to produce an environmenal impact statement for review by the public.

And then the road presently running from the Yukon River to Prudhoe Bay was one that was built by Alyeska with its contractors as a means to make possible the construction of the northern half of

the TransAlaska oil pipeline.

The authority for construction, including the right-of-way, gravel sources, et cetera, is the TransAlaska Pipeline Authozation Act of 1973, and amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

The entire purpose of this Act in the language of the Act, indicate that Congress proceed and authorize the road as the necessary precursor to the Pipeline itself. Nothing in the act indicates that Congress considered the haul road as a public highway, and, especially, one finds no evidence that the intent of congress was to weigh further proceedings under the National Environmental Policy Act for the road in any capacity, other than as a pipeline construction facility.

Then we go on to say that the pipeline haul road was built to specifications similar to those of a gravel surfaced public highway. This was done by Alyeska at the request of the Alaska Department of Highways.

In interpreting this request, we should recall that former Governor Keith Miller asked the 1970 legislature to appropriate money for the road. A request the legislature wisely and resoundingly refused.

We should also remember the State could have planned this road as part of its Federal Aid Highway System, like every other major road in the state.

The cost of the State would, in such a case, be five to six percent of the total construction cost, the rest coming from the Federal Highway Trust Fund. This is less, by far, than the State will have to pay by having Alyeska build in excess of its needs, as the cost of the road will add to oil transport costs, reduce well head prices for oil, and hence reduce State revenues.

The Alaska Conservation Society concludes that the agreement between the State and Alyeska was a way for the State to avoid the requirements of planning inherant in the Department of Transportation procedure, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination

inherant in the Department of Transportation
procedure, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination
Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.
Clearly Congress, in including the haul road in its
favorable action to the TransAlaska Oil Pipeline
decision, didn't make a decision to open northern
Alaska with a public highway.

We are opposed to the road being open, and this goes on quite a bit longer, but I won't read all of it.

That is the background and the basis for our position.

And you can all make copies of this, and I will give

a copy to him.

MR. ROBERTSON:

Any further questions from the panel?

MR. DAVIES:

I'm trying to understand the position. Isn't it a fact there are additional resources to be developed as a result of the road being there, and and environmental impact statement -- what would your position be?

MS. STONOROV:

Well, maybe I better read the rest of this.

The Alaska Conservation Society is opposed to opening the road. We think that public acceptance of this road to be delayed until we know what we are getting into.

We are aware of mineral deposits in this area, and believe they could be exploited without the road. Studies have been undertaken relating to this matter. MIRL Report #29, and an FAA study of air transport costs as compared to highway transport costs over the Hickel Highway. Those are two studies.

We are concerned about recreational values in the Brooks Range that would be destroyed by such a road.

North of the Yukon does have (indsicernible) in any people, and the lure of opening it up is before us. That present value, and the benefit it imparts to people that are visiting or contemplating it, will not be diminished, rather, it will always become greater if the area is not connected to the vehicle population of North America.

Access is not being denied. The area's charm has been, and will continue to be enhanced by the more unique means of travel available. Riverboat, aircraft dog sled, snow machine, snow shoe and shoe leather. Villages have been and will continue to have access to fresh — continue to be relatively safe from maurauding wheeled (indiscernible), yet will have access to fresh groceries, fuel, mail, movies, libraries, schools, electronic communication and building goods.

Resource extraction can be accomplished as can guided tours for everyone. Hunting, trapping, fishing, hiking and boating are available and are quality experiences in the absence of roads.

Another concern is that we know that studies of caribou and moose, and their ability to move freely back and forth in this area are currently underway.

We cannot afford to strengthen the road barrier until

we know more about their movements and the effects of the road on them.

The time has come to anticipate the coming realities that our energy using binge is over, and that the automobile highway petroleum industrial complex faces the end of its ability mercilessly to proliferate across the faces of our landscapes and habitats.

The era of this proliferation in U. S. history will be looked upon as wasteful, wanton, inhuman in its effects on people's homes and community fabric and thoughtlessly destructive of wild lands and scenic values.

The Alaska Conservation Society in this historical context, and in consideration, not only for conservation of wild land values north of the Yukon River, but also considerations for the riches of our Native Alaska Community for selfdetermination in choosing the options they could live best with has made these observations and recommendations.

So does that answer your -- that was the rest of the statement. I actually didn't think we would be talking about it today. I will be glad to leave it here.

1	MR.	ROBERT	SON:
2			Are there other questions from the panel?
3	MR.	WOOD:	
4			Presumably in view of your position, you would also
5			oppose the extension of that road for any road
6			system into Naval Petroleum Reserve #4?
7	MS.	STONOR	OV:
8			The extension of this road into the Petroleum
9			Reserve I would rather not speak for the
10			Society until that has not been taken up by the
11			board, and I would rather not say point blank that
12			we would or would not.
13			We are opposed to opening up that road until we
14			know more of what we are getting into, is what this
15			statement says, and I think I just better leave it
16			at that for right now.
17	MR.	WOOD:	
18			Thank you.
19	MR.	ROBERT	SON:
20			Any other questions.
21	MR.	GRYC:	
22			The Hickel Highway you referred to, of course, is
23			not the haul road, is that correct?
24	MS.	STONOR	OV:
25			It's not the haul road, but it is parallel to the

2		place from the same place.
3	MR. GRYC:	
4		Studies cite it was the Hickel Highway and not the
5		haul road?
6	MS. STONOR	ROV:
7		That is correct. But the Hickel Highway goes to
8		Prodhoe Bay from Fairbanks. That was the point
9		of that being in there.
10	MR. ROBERT	SON:
11		Any other questions from the panel?
12		Thank you.
13	MR. COOK:	
14		Since you got into that so deep, there is a couple of
15		things that I might say that would be useful.
16	-	For one thing, you might say I represent the
17		membership of close to four hundred seven thousand
18		or eight thousand jobs, but in regard to the Bureau
19		of Land Management, they did a good job in mine and
20		other people of many other's views of anticipating
21		the possibility of that road the probability of
22		that road being open, and in getting some preliminary
23		data together so we have as Alaskans, have
24		something to work with. And I think BLM should be
25		complimented for showing the intiative to do that

haul road, let's put it that way, going to the same

before many other people were -- there are talks about a number of assumptions. Many people -- I think most people assume that the road will be open after Alyeska was finished.

And another thing is, a lot of us recognize that

Alaska is short of roads. We don't have public

access to -- convenient public access to enough of
our country.

And I think that another thing that some of these views indicate is that they distrust the free enterprise system to do what has been seen that it can do, and that is develop things logically, as long as we know what the rules are.

It tells you the rules if you are in a position of doing so. The free enterprise system can and has done a beautiful job of it, but there are a lot of -- as you can see from her presentation, from some of the things I would say, there are a lot of differences of opinion, but I want you to be very careful to be sure that you get a balance for them, and be sure that you are getting the opinions of -- you are trying to get an evaluation of how many people in those opinions are genuinely represented.

MR. ROBERTSON:

Thank you, Mr. Cook.

Are there -- is there anyone else in the audience that would like to speak on the haul road?

Please come forward.

Please give your name and affiliation.

MR. KAWALSKI:

My name is Jim Kawalski, and I am the Alaska Field Representative for Friends of the Earth, and also the executive director of the Fairbanks Environmental Center.

I just wanted to sort of try to answer Dr. Davies' question or suggest that you look, or request of the Governor's Policy Council, the results of their recent five public meetings that were held around the state, to try to get a better answer to your question, about how Alaskans feel about the haul road.

That was really the only point I wanted to make.

I should, maybe, reinforce Tina's point. Congress authorized a haul road, which turned out to be a public highway, because they accepted the 1971 agreement on face value without examining it, is what they -- it was, essentially, a contract, which said a State highway would be open -- that is, the haul road would be open as a public highway, after it was turned over to the State of Alaska.

25

In the process of doing that, then the haul road was, as a public highway, exempted from further scrutiny under the National Environmental Policy Act, processed along with the Pipeline. As we all know, the Pipeline was exempted by authorization of Congress from further scrutiny NEPA, and by a collegue between Senator Stevens and Senator The haul road and three state airports Jackson. got quickly included in that exemption. Some of us were a little disappointed. We weren't on the ball. I think we could have at least made a little more sense out of it at the time, but we were asleep at the switch, I'm afraid. So I wish you would look at that. It seems to me the, though, the question is, whether the haul road is a public highway or one that you could -- more or less as it is being used now, for what we might call industrial purposes. question isn't clear in my mind as to what you are asking -- as to whether you are asking that, or whether you are asking about the public uses of highway.

I just started reading Mr. Robertson's speach on the best potential energy source is fuel conservation, and I wonder if we are talking about a public

highway. 2 MR. DAVIES: 3 I guess my question stems that there perhaps may not be a great need to haul large quantities of 5 material during the exploration phase than during 6 the production phase, and if we go into the production 7 of PET #4, there would be, and this would be one 8 alternative. And if the road was kept closed 9 and not available, then that reduces the 10 (indiscernible). 11 Since there is no law, and this study and the far. 12 along study and the bill that was signed by the 13 president three days ago, which will continue to 14 look after ways to explore and produce PET #4, 15 and also can lead to recommendations by legislation, 16 that whatever options might be foreclosed by the time 17 we can get ready for production. 18 That is why I was questioning 19 MR. KAWALSKI: 20 Could I -- I just have a couple of brief things to 21 say and then I won't have to come back. 22 do that now? 23 MR. ROBERTSON: 24 Please continue.

highway, or we are talking about an industrial

1

25

MR. KAWALSKI:

We are interested in the provisions that now appear in the conference report, which I misplaced and didn't get to read, but I did see that the conferees in their report did ask for the formation of a task force that would involve a number of interest who would explore surface values that would be in addition to those subsurface values that you are mostly interested in, and I just wanted to emphasize that that is a very — I think a very serious concern.

We want to see that done properly. There are some sensitive areas in PET #4, particularly the Utikok camping grounds for the Western Arctic Caribou herd, also the Tshipuk (phonetic) Lake Region, which is a very important waterfowl breeding habitat.

I believe the initial concern over these two areas is probably the reason why that task force provision ended up in there.

There has been a tremendous concern, in recent weeks, at the annual meeting of the Board of Game which set policies for the Fish and Game Department with regard to the very rapid decline of the Arctic Caribou herd.

I think the number is something like 100,000

estimated that it has dropped, and -- within recent years, so there is a very dynamic situation going on up there with regard to caribou, and caribou population effects many people beyond those of the North Slope.

In fact, the entire Kobuk River Region and even over into Aniktuvik (phonetic), and into the upper regions of the Koyukuk (phonetic) River, where people live to depend on winder caribou, and the decline is now worrying them.

The bag limits have been set for the first time, where, previously there was no limit, in terms of hunting.

So what happens in the Koyukuk area could effect a great area south and west of PET #4, so I hope you are aware of that. You will give that special emphasis.

MR. DAVIES:

Well, one of the explicit charges in the legislation is that we do consider the environmental social and economic impact upon -- words in the legislation on the Alaska Natives. Could we have interpreted that in a much broader context.

So this is one of the purposes we are here this week, just exactly what you are talking about now.

1	We appreciate your appearing.
2	MR. KAWALSKI:
3	Well, that's all I have to say.
4	MR. ROBERTSON:
5	Are there other questions from the panel?
6	Thank you, Mr. Kawalski.
7	MRS. WALTON:
8	Are you through with the roads?
9	MR. ROBERTSON:
10	If you want to talk to us on the road, we would like
11	to hear from you.
12	MRS. WALTON:
13	I would just like to say that you are kind of
14	drawboarding that to death, and the road is going
15	to remain open, and thank God for Senator Stevens,
16	that he did get this exemption in there.
17	The road was built in 154 days. If the State was
18	allowed to build it it would take 20 years.
19	You wouldn't have an option for transportation. You
20	would decline it, or you would be going by ocean.
21	I think the concensus is more than a concensus.
22	The majority of the people in the state are for it.
23	I could talk to you in detail on that, and I probably
24	am the only woman that has been over it four times,
25	and I just got back except the truck drivers.

1	I am very interested in it and I could tell you a
2	lot about it, and it will remain open.
3	MR. ROBERTSON:
4	By the way
5	MRS. WALTON:
6	I would like to go on to these other subjects, like
7	the geology and reserves and all the things that
8	you are really interested in for PET #4.
9	MR. ROBERTSON:
10	I would like to have you come to the table, and I
11	would like to get your name and your affiliation
12	and let's take up the other topics, also.
13	MRS. WALTON:
14	I don't want to talk about them. There are experts
15	here. I mean, there are experts all over this
16	room to talk about those subjects.
1.7	MR. ROBERTSON:
18	All right. Would you give us your name, please.
19	MRS. WALTON:
20	Yeah. Mike Walton.
21	MR. ROBERTSON:
22	And your affiliation?
23	MRS. WALTON:
24	I work for Senator Ted Stevens.
25	

T	MR. RO	BERTSON:
2		All right.
3		The next person signed up to talk is Mr. John Cook.
4	MR. CO	OK:
5		I'm not really following you around, I got here
6		before you did. I didn't know you were going to
7		have a hearing here, also.
8	MR. RO	BERTSON:
9		Would you state your affiliation?
ιο	MR. CO	OK:
11		John Cook. Archeologist. I'm research archeologist
12		at the University with the Insitute of Arctic
13		Biology.
L4		Although this is not my comments here are not
L5		particularly on archeology I gave that yesterday,
16		and I think I will let that stand pretty well.
L7		I did have another concern, and it is associated
۱8		with archeology, in the sense that you are interest
١9		in all data coming from and going to PET #4.
20		Some of the testimony yesterday concerned the
21		release the public release of seismic data,
22		geologic data. However, there was something
23		sort of lacking, and that is one of the key
24		areas in terms of research, knowledge for early
25		man studies, is the geomorphic history of Alaska

the glacial history.

The Bering Land Bridge is assumably the path by which the new world was inhabited. We know very little about -- relatively, about the geomorphic history of Alaska, particularly the time period, say, 20,000 to 70,000 years ago.

Now, this is obviously a time period in which the petroleum geologists are not interested. It is a time period in which the socio cultural people -- people interested in impact on socio cultural affairs are not interested. But it is something that we are interested in.

As an archeologist we have enough work to do just trying to get the sites excavated, analyzed, without getting into a great deal of geomorphic technology. As a for instance, Alyeska drilled 80,000 or is drilling 80,000 holes some 20 to 50 feet deep for the elevated pipeline.

This data, or the data that would come from these holes is not available. There is no soil data, no pollen data, no pallotological pollen, small mammel data.

And I would say that roughly ten percent of these holes are bringing up fossils. None of this is available.

Now, USGS, Ann Crell, of the Coal Regions Research Lab, attempted to obtain these data. They were not able to. So as a backup we are attempting to salvage some of it.

Now, perhaps this question -- question or problem is directed toward Dr. Gryc, in the sense that what kinds of efforts information is going to come from NPR #4 relative to this kind of problem area? Are there any -- is there any provision for quoternerary studies as opposed to petroleum geology or engineering geology.

This is something that has been seriously lacking in all previous studies in the north, except for individual research programs. However, the data is there, it could be accumulated, collected and disseminated in conjunction with a great number of the other impact studies.

MR. ROBERTSON:

I'm afraid our panel doesn't have answers for you.
MR. COOK:

I realize there are no answers, but I would like to see the panel and the report that you are preparing, at least address this question to a certain extent and make a provision for these kinds of data to come out of such studies.

MR. COOK:

Well, as you well know, the data that they are collecting has relatively very little bearing on climate -- on climatological problems, and the samples -- the few samples that we have been able to collect are not going to solve these kinds of problems, but the opportunity is there. And for 10,000 miles of seismic line or whatever the NPR #4, the opportunities are really staggering, if even a proportion of that were to be gathered.

MR. ROBERTSON:

Are there questions from the panel?

MR. WOOD:

I might help to assuage some of your concern, Doctor. We have taken samples from each of the core holes, and at present they have not been given to the public for various reasons, but each of the seismic shot holes that have been drilled, we maintain a sample on it, and there are also driller's logs, that could be gone back and checked, and we maintain records where each of the samples were taken from, and we do have them, they haven't been simply disposed of.

MR. COOK:

I'm very happy to hear that, because this is much more than Alyeska has done.

four or five decades, and they represent an extremely

limited amount of information in terms of the area covered, and yet the significance of the finds which have been made are quite outstanding, especially with this limited amount of research.

There are a number of existing laws and policies which require the inventorying and protection of such resources on government lands, and in conjunction with any federally funded project.

Among these are the National Environmental Policy

Act, Executive Board Room 11593, relating to the

protection and enhancement of the cultural environment,

Public Law 93291, which is the Archeological

Conservation Act of 1974.

I think it is vital that the stewards of NPR #4, whomever they may be, whether it be BLM or some other federal agency, exercise their responsiblity in these matters, and I hope that you aren't affronted by my questioning whether that stewardship may not be exercised responsibly.

I recommend strongly that these cultural resources be considered in the stages of planning, and that a detailed set of procedures for protecting these resources during the development of NPR #4, be promulgated as part of your report.

It also appears necessary that our cultural resources

speak at this time.

MR. ROBERTSON:

All right. Would any of you like to come forward and give us the benefit of your advice and concern.

MR. REES:

My name is Chuck Rees -- R-e-e-s. I am president of North Star, Incorporated here in Fairbanks.

It is 133 acre industrial park. I am a newcomer to Alaska. I have only been here 27 years. I have to go three more years to become -- before I become a Pioneer.

I think that is important to state, because I came up here because I thought this was a great place to live, because there were a lot of wide open spaces, because I was a conservationist, and because I liked the environment. So I got three more years to prove myself before the other people who are pioneers of Alaska will accept me in their exclusive club. It takes thirty years requirements to prove that you like the country.

Now, our industrial park is probably the most environmentally safe industrial park that has ever been put in. We even tried to go even further and put all electric heat in, so that we wouldn't have to worry about any of these fears that people have that

If there are any archeological sites, they are going to be along the coast. So I think somebody better start defining, instead of in shotgun broad terms saying what has to be protected -- in a broad term you are talking about a mess of an amount of land out there. Let's be specific.

Are we talking about just the strip along the coast, or does somebody got some definite proof that somewhere back in the ice age there were cities of Eskimos or towns or villages located on the mass of that tundra plain, which is where they are going to explore.

Now, if my memory serves me, when I worked on the PET #4 project, and there is an engineer here that was on that project, who can probably state it -- it seems to me the big oil fields were down in the Umiat area and over on Umalak (phonetic) and along the Kogil (phonetic) River and Fish Creek.

Now, I am doing that from a long time ago working for United Geophysical.

I also worked on the digging of the gas well -- drilling it or whatever you call it at Point Barrow, the one that is now serving the village.

We didn't carry the tundra. They brought up a big monstrous sled that had a drilling rig on it, and the only thing that was on the tundra was the two runners

of the sleds, and the mud tanks and the living quarters and everything else were all on sleds, and everything connected up, and as soon as the gas well came in there was a little shack left there and the rest of the stuff disappeared, and all you had was a gas line running into the Barrow village.

And as far as I know, it would be interesting if someone went up there, and the place had disappeared, but, in reality, it didn't.

With the techniques of drilling today, if the oil field is discovered here, and this happens to be an archeological site, it is not impossible to tell the oil company to move their pad over here and drill in sideways.

And, in essence, what I am trying to tell you is, if you lay the rules down in the beginning, and if you have the specifics, from the people who are against projects, they can give you specifics. Make them say, in total -- not in total, I'm against this thing, but I don't think this is right, because this area contains this, and this area contains that, and this is the proven fact of it. Then you could build the specifications that your road is going to have to make a corkscrew around this, you are going to have to stop construction work when the falcons are nesting

and they -- wherever it was up there they had to stop work, they can't span a river like they have done now, because the spawning is going to take place, you don't want to get the gravel stirred up. It is possible to build, as long as you know in advance what you want done.

Now, as far as anything happening north of here, of massive population areas, I can't see that. I think if anybody really got down to the cold hard facts, Fairbanks, Alaska is about as far north as a decent metropolis can get. Because it doesn't take you over five minutes if you have the time to drive out the Steetz Highway, which is the entrance to the north land, and you are in hills five minutes out, and you will never get out of them. So your next point that you really have a decent chance of drilling anything is up at the Yukon River at Circle, and I think if you just take some climatatic reports or get your temperatures year around, you are going to find out that's crazy.

So your jumping off point is here, and what we are really talking about -- we are really talking about one road, sixty foot wide, heading north to mineral developments which will be continued in small areas, to exploration developments and to prospectors going

1	-	Brewer, and I may have overlooked two or three people
2		that had worked on the line just as Chuck Rees.
3		And I would like to prevail upon those people who
4		know the country, to talk, because they are very
5		highly qualified engineers and geologists.
6	MR.	ROBERTSON:
7		All right, who wants to be first?
8	DR.	WOODS:
9		Jim Dalton.
10	MR.	DALTON:
11		My name is James Dalton, I reside in Fairbanks, and
12		I
13	MR.	ROBERTSON:
14		Would you like to sit down there in the chair, please
15	MR.	DALTON:
16		I am in favor of submitting a document in writing,
17		a briefing of my experience of the work they are
18		doing, and I would be happy to do that.
19	MR.	ROBERTSON:
20		Let me ask, when could we receive such a paper?
21	MR.	DALTON:
22		When do you want it? Two weeks?
23	MR.	ROBERTSON:
24		We would like it as soon as you could possibly get it
25		for us because we are behind on our timed date.

1		If you could get it
2	MR. D.	ALTON:
3		I could have it for you in a couple weeks.
4	MR. R	OBERTSON:
5		All right.
6	DR. W	OODS:
7		Mr. Chairman, let me interrupt just a moment.
8	MR. R	OBERTSON:
9		Yes, Dr. Woods.
10	DR. W	OODS:
11		Out of thirty years experience up there, he's an
12		engineer. He's got a depth of knowledge that you
13		will find it difficult fathom. If you asked specific
14	·	questions of this man, he will give you information
15		that is priceless.
16	MR. R	OBERTSON:
17		I wonder Dr. Davies, do you have a question?
18	MR. D	AVIES:
19		Just that Mr. Dalton has stated he would submit
20		a document in writing, I think that is his preference,
21		and I will accept that.
22	MR. R	OBERTSON:
23		Would you send the paper to Mr. Fred Chei of the
24		Anchorage Sub-Regional Office, Room G-11, Anchorage,
25		just as soon as you could get it, and we would be
1	l .	

1		very interested in receiving it.
2	MR. DAI	LTON:
3		Thank you.
4	MR. ROE	BERTSON:
5		Any questions from the panel?
6		Thank you, sir.
7	MR. FIN	NEGAN:
8		Mr. Chairman, are we still on the haul road?
9	MR. ROE	BERTSON:
10		We are taking testimony on any subject pertaining to
11		PET #4. If you would like to talk to us about that,
12		we would like to hear from you.
13	MR. FIN	INEGAN:
14		Well, I would just like to submit a resolution.
15		First of all, my name is Finnegan. I am with the
16		Tenana Chief's Conference.
17		At the recent convention it was held the resolution
18		was passed that we resolved at the Tanana Chief's
19		Conference (indiscernible) the 19th day of March,
20		1976.
21		It says, "Hereby oppose the opening of the North
22	·	Slope haul road to the public subsequent to construction
23		of the TransAlaska Pipeline." (reading from document).
24		I would submit the body of it as an evidentiary matter.
25		

1	MR.	ROBERTSON:
2		Would you give it to Mr. Don Jean.
3	MR.	FINNEGAN:
4		That is the extent of our testimony.
5	MR.	ROBERTSON:
6		Let's see if there are any questions from the panel.
7		Any questions from the panel on this subject?
8	MR.	DAVIES:
9		I didn't get your name.
10	MR.	FINNEGAN:
11		My last name is Finnegan, and my first name is
12		Patrick. And for your information, the Tanana
13		Chief's Conference is a 43 member group, traditionally
14		organized, and it covers a region from Eagle on the
15		Yukon River to Holy Cross in the lower Delta area.
16		The northernmost villages, Arctic Village, the
17		southernmost is down around Healy, and the area is
18		approximately that of the Doyon (phonetic) Regional
19		Corporation.
20		The pipeline and haul road effectively bisect the
21		area north of the Yukon.
22	MR.	ROBERTSON:
23		Mr. Wood.
24	MR.	WOOD:

Mr. Finnegan, could you please elaborate a little bit

4

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

just why the chiefs oppose the haul road? MR. FINNEGAN:

> I think probably it would be simpler, if you don't mind, if I started right from the top on this, because it was done in convention form.

> The Tanana Chief's Conference, Inc. is an Indian tribe as defined in the Indian Self Determination Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and is recognized by the Secretary of Interior, and, whereas, due to the TransAlaska Pipeline system, a haul road has been constructed for delivery of equipment, materials and people through areas utilized by the members of the Tanana Chief's Conference for subsistence hunting, fishing and trapping, and whereas the people of the Tanana Chief's Region are concerned about the impact of the opening of the haul road, and the quality of life traditionally enjoyed by the people of the Tanana Chief's Conference, and whereas, the permanant maintence of the North Slope haul road would present a costly burden upon the citizens of Alaska, whose taxes are extended at a rate of state income at present, and whereas the migratory patterns of fish, fowl, indigenous game and species native to the region penetrated by the haul road, has already been altered, and it will be further

1	changed by the increased hunting pressure attended to
2	the public opening of the road.
3	Now, therefore, let it be resolved that the Tanana
4	Chief's Conference, Assemble and Convention, does
5	hereby oppose the opening the the North Slope haul
6	road to the public subsequent to construction of the
7	TransAlaska Pipeline.
8	MR. ROBERTSON:
9	Thank you, sir.
10	MR. LEDOSQUE:
11	Could you tell us how many villages there are in the
12	Tanana Chief's Conference?
13	MR. FINNEGAN:
14	Forty-three.
15	MR. LEDOSQUE:
16	Forty-three villages.
17	And could you, also, for the record, tell us the
18	proximity of these villages to the haul road? That
19	is, the distance these villages are located to the
20	haul road, and how many are effected?
21	MR. FINNEGAN:
22	Off the top of my head I can't give you that
23	information. I could give it to you in the writter
24	form within the period of time that you are talking
25	about, but it is a relatively simple matter to sit

1	down with a map and	
2	MR. LEDOSQUE:	
3	Could I ask you, are there quite a few villages, or	
4	are there very few villages?	
5	MR. FINNEGAN:	
6	Of the forty-three I would just off the top Mr.	
7	Morgan is more familiar with the terrain than I am,	
8	but I would say that there are relatively few within,	
9	say, fifty miles of the line itself.	
10	UNKNOWN PERSON:	
11	Two at the most.	
12	MR. FINNEGAN:	
13	Two at the most, but I'm not sure. Those I'm	
14	familiar with.	
15	MR. LEDOSQUE:	
16	Could you furnish the distance and number of villages	
17	and then proximity	
18	MR. FINNEGAN:	
19	Right, the ones that would be effected.	
20	Also, what time element are we talking about?	
21	MR. ROBERTSON:	
22	We would like to get the information as soon as we	
23	could get it.	
24	MR. FINNEGAN:	
25	Is tomorrow all right.	

1	MR.	ROBERTSON:
2		Tomorrow would be delightful, if you could
3	MR.	FINNEGAN:
4		Well, are you going to be in Fairbanks?
5	MR.	ROBERTSON:
6		No. Send it down to the Anchorage office.
7		Any questions from the panel?
8		Thank you.
9		Mr. Brewer, are you going to give us the benefit of
10		your
11	MR.	BREWER:
12		Mr. Chairman, I am Max Brewer, former resident of
13		Barrow for six years in the study of permafrost,
14		director of the Naval Arctic Laboratory from the
15		period 1956 to 1971.
16		I have been very much interested in listening to
17		the testimony the last couple of days. I would hate
18		to think that the panel would get the impression
19		that PET #4 is an area that is totally unknown,
20		or that scientifically it still possesses its
21		virginity.
22		The first known scientific project on the Naval
23		Petroleum Reserve occurred at Barrow with the first
24		International Geophysical year, in 1881 to 1883.
25		Prior to the formation of the cities of Fairbanks or

1954 and came back in about 1960, and found some chars that he though were approximately 7000 years old.

I think that we should also take a look at the question of the Bering Sea Land Bridge, and it seems as though the geologists and the archeologists are in cahoots, because every time they want to get a new infusion of people from the old country across the water, they the run the Bering land bridge up and down like a yo-yo.

I would like to comment that there is no reason that people couldn't have gone across the Bering Sea last winter or fifty years ago, or seventy years ago. Back in fact, one of my former employees was born in Siberia.

But you don't have to have land when you have solid water to walk on, and ice is something that ene could walk on.

I personally would like to see the archeologists and geologists get out of bed and check out the problem.

Now, in many other fields of science on the North

Slope there has been quite a bit of work done.

The Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, in 1947, over
69 million dollars has been spent in the pursuit of basic (indiscernible) in the North Slope of Alaska and in the Arctic Basin.

25

operation will not slip into some of the old ways, because you have a rotation of people, and I think that the government has the responsibility to make sure that things are accomplished in the proper manner, but I don't think that we should ignor what history is available, and what can be used. I would like to mention that the Naval Arctic Research bibliography, published in 1973, prepared in 1972, listed over 2400 scientific works that had been published for the North Slope of Alaska. There have been many published since then. much information available in the files that can be used, but as a starter, I would suggest Arctic Institute publication, Naval Arctic Research Laboratory bibliography, and I believe it is bulletin #24.

As far as the socio economics, I think that we might take a look there and realize that under the old setup you could have very few villages in the Arctic with a population of only about 300, because that was about as far as the people could satisfactorily arrange to hunt in a bad year and provide the sport for people

I think we are looking at Barrow with a population of 2600, with a subsistence take of land that is

probably less than it was twenty years ago, or twenty-five, when it had a population of 800.

We have a dollar economy in many of the communities. In others we have a modified subsistence, and I think it can be considered a way of life, and the people's modifications of their cultural pattern.

I think that we make mistakes when we theorize and don't look at reality.

And when that bind that people can turn down jobs in the city of Barrow. One Native working for a Native group, where the salary is \$14.95 per hour, I have to conclude that that is modified subsistence.

Perhaps hunting is more important to them than the people in Fairbanks. But here in Fairbanks if you don't get your moose, there is something else you have to give up during that winter.

If you go further south, and perhaps you don't have a moose, you might settle for a deer, or if you fish, but still, we are all on this type of economy. The smaller villages, it's greater, but I think we could look at the overall subsistence.

I am very happy to have been nominated to provide some comments. I think that the nominator was perhaps the man who should have been up here talking, but I have been very happy to have the opportunity, and I

1		will try to answer any questions.
2	MR.	ROBERTSON:
3		Thank you, Mr. Brewer.
4		Any questions? Dr. Davies?
5	MR.	DAVIES:
6		Whatever chars we have here to determine what the
7	-	interests of the people are, how would you go about
8		those (indiscernible)? But I think you are correct
9		in saying this was not brought out in the open
10		yesterday.
11	MR.	ROBERTSON:
12		Any other questions?
13	MR.	LEDOSQUE:
14		I would like to ask one question.
15		There has been some discussion about a road from
16		Barrow to the existing haul road at Prudhoe Bay.
17		Do you have an impression as to the feasibility of
18		that, or its impact?
19	MR.	BREWER:
20		Many things are feasible if you throw enough money
21		at them. As to whether one should build such a road,
22		I think it requires some analysis of what do we want
23		to do with it, and what would people most intimately
24		connected want to do with it. What would be some
25		of the trade offs.

And I think that the idea of building a road from .

Prudhoe to PET #4, from the standpoint of exploration,
is very questionable.

I think that once and should exploration come up and provide a resource of very considerable magnitude, then I think that a road would have to be considered. However, by that time one would know where the resource was, from whence, perhaps a road should be constructed, what associated facilities one might want with that road.

Now, this looks at it strictly from the standpoint of the exploration of PET #4. It is not considered the social desirability of whether people would want a road from PET #4 to, say, Barrow.

I think that this is -- the social desirability of that road should be addressed to the people.

I would be happy to comment as 127/100ths of the people in that regard, but that is from a social standpoint.

I think that from the exploration, which means that you are trying to develop an inventory of resources, means your land in selected areas, you are there for a short time until you obtained the inventory of the area, and I don't think that in that particular environment it is very difficult to build a road,

and that such a road could be justified.

Also, as one builds a road from east to west, on PET #4, one has to consider that there are difficulties with crossing numerous streams, that there is a possible road building material in the form of gravel and that you got to have a jolly good reason for building it.

For instance, if a resource happened to be discovered in the southern sector of PET #4, or in the western sector of PET #4, one might not want to build a road from Prudhoe to PET #4, one might want to take off at Bettles, go through Anaktuvik Pass and then follow the foothills area, or, perhaps, even the Coghill Valley, if that were a possibility, and it might provide a route far less costly, far less damaging to the environment.

I think that extensions of roads requires that we have to know what is on the other end of the road that we want to move, and where the other end of the road is, and an analysis of the engineering, the economic feasibility and the social desirability of the road.

I personally think that a discussion of the haul read that runs north/south to Prudhoe Bay and PET #4 is inappropriate until such time as there has been an

1	i i	nventory completed, a major resource discovery on
2	P	PET #4.
3	MR. ROBERT	CSON:
4	M	fr. Davies?
5	MR. DAVIES	S:
6	A	are there areas in PET #4 that you think
7		(indiscernible)?
8	MR. BREWER	₹:
9	T	here are areas in PET #4 that have resources of an
10	i	mportant nature, and that need to be considered.
11	Т	There is, for example, the question of the Western
12	А	arctic caribou heard which comes in to a portion of
13	P	ET #4, as its major calfing area within PET #4
14	f	rom middle May until through, perhaps, the first
15	₩	week in June.
16	C	Certainly, one does not want to get out there when
17	t	the caribou are grouping for a major portion of the
18	C	alfing, and engage in a significant noisy or
19	е	extensive operation.
20	Н	lowever, for about eleven months of the year caribou
21	a	ren't calfing, and if one takes care to consider
22	w	hat the needs are, and if one does not tear up a
23	s	significant, or otherwise alter a significant portion
24	0	of the caribou habitat, then occasional things, other
25	+	than the caribou can exist in a compatible manner.

For instance, there is in the legislature a bill that would have the caribou habitat. It's on PET #4.

Quite candidly it misses some of the good calfing grounds in other areas, that caribou are smarter than man, they want to calf there, but does not consider areas outside of PET #4, and I think the came could be said about the paragon falcon.

One does not want to disturb paragon falcon. One does not want to disturb the habitat that could effect paragon falcon.

But certainly an airplane flying over a falcon nest when the falcons have all gone south is not really going to disturb the falcons.

I think we could say the same thing about certain nesting and moulting birds. And it requires a certain amount of knowledge, an understanding of the habitat, and a working together by resource managers. I don't think that Alaska, whether it be PET #4 or anyplace else, can afford to say, "Well, something might occur here, so everybody stay out 365 days a year." Particularly that that occurrance that might happen would be restricted to a couple or three weeks.

MR. ROBERTSON:

Any other questions from the panel?

MR. GRYC:

I might comment on your bibliography. There are over a thousand papers written by you on the North Slope of Alaska, and undoubtedly several hundred more by other geologists.

MR. ROBERTSON:

Any other questions?
Thank you, Mr.Brewer.

Do you have one more person to nominate, Dr. Woods?
DR. WOODS:

Those three that I -- I hope I haven't overlooked anybody. Jim Messer is back there. Jim has been around a long time.

MR. MESSER:

My name is Jim Messer. I would just like to make a couple of comments. I'm an automobile dealer. I lived here 28 years. I have a lot of claims to claim, I guess. I served on the Chamber of Commerce several terms, school board, past president of the Rotary, JayCee's. Most recently I'm on the Board of Directors for OMAR. That is, Organization of Manangment of Alaska Resources, made up of conservationists, labor. Right now the Alaska pipeline, which we hope will be brought through Fairbanks and down to the coast. At least it looks like it will come through Fairbanks.

I have been a hunter and a fisherman ever since I've lived here, and I can't remember when I haven't killed a moose, unless it was last year, and I did kill a wolf last year.

On the road, I would just like to say what Mike Walton said, I don't think there is a chance -- it seems rediculous, it is kind of like closing off the west when it was first developed, and this may happen on the road.

Caribou -- a real good friend of mine has been on the Fish and Game board for many years. A few years ago, and this was fifteen years ago, he was talking about the caribou herds being so large, they were going to lose part of them, they were going to split and go over into Canada, so they wanted to harvest as much as they could, and for many years, in fact, I don't know for how many years, there has been so season and no limit on caribou north of the range.

Anyone, Native or white, could go up and shoot a hundred, the only restriction, you should take care of, or are supposed to take care of what you have shot. And I believe it is just recently they have a place -- "recently" -- I'm talking about this year. Prior to this time, and you may hear a lot about the

1 dwindling caribou herd, and certainly, with the care that has been taken up there, by no season, no limit, 2 3 it should have been, but I would certainly think conservation measures, like limiting it to maybe 5 four or five per person, or something, it might come 6 back into something. That's all I have to say. 7 MR. ROBERTSON: 8 9 Any questions from the panel? DR. WOODS: 10 11 Mr. Chairman, there is one other person I have in mind here. He is what is known as a native born 12 13 Alaskan, because he was born in Juneau, which is kind of a blot on discussions for him. 14 Earl Beistline, 15 the dean of the School of whatever they call it now, 16 at the University of Alaska, the Northern Region. 17 He also knows, virtually, everybody and anything that 18 has happened in Alaska. 19 MR. ROBERTSON: 20 I hear a call for Dr. Beistline. 21 MR. BEISTLINE: 22 Mr. Chairman, I am Earl Beistline of Fairbanks, 23 Alaska. 24 I think, perhaps, I fully agree with the statement 25 that Max Brewer has made, but the person that is

capital and private leasing

MR. BEISTLINE:

I think, first of all, what is essential is the existence of the operation of a mining law in the area. Now, the mining laws, of course, pertain to the metalics, by and large, this type of material. This allows the individual, the company, to get in and to search for those types of deposits in the area.

Geologically, there is some indication that there could be metallic deposits in the area now within PET #4, including possibly uranium. We are just speaking geologically, now, rather than saying there is a deposit here.

You have to have people getting in, you have to have people searching and looking, and if we could do this, then more resources will come to life.

Then, also, the preference of the mineral leasing laws. Those laws applying to coal, oil, gas, this type of thing, should certainly be allowed to exist. Now, these laws exist, then private enterprise could operate under those regulations.

Does that verify it a little?

MR. DAVIES:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTSON:

Any further questions.

MR. DAVIES:

Would you care to comment as far as the production of the oil and gaslines itself, with respect to private versus government?

MR. BEISTLINE:

I am very much in favor of private enterprise taking over and/or into production.

I think that certainly government has its place. We have seen some excellent work, and there will be a great deal more by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Mines in basic work. But, then, by our form of government, the way that the nation is being descript, I think the private enterprise is essential for this.

Certainly you could say I am in favor of development, there is no question about that, I think it is absolutely essential for the state, but this could be done in ways that will consider pollution, we will consider land rehabilitation, the environment, those

MR. DAVIES:

factors.

With respect to timing this development, there was some testimony yesterday that suggested that we

defer development until the existing pipeline is no longer being (indiscernible) and PET #4 could be used, more or less, to fill the void, as opposed to possibly building a new pipeline.

MR. BEISTLINE:

It's my thought that we should move ahead as rapidly as we can, we just do not want to run out of time.

I think every person in the room, probably is familiar with the oil situation that we have had in the past year or so, or that the nation has had a whole.

You just do not develop resources overnight and have them assessible, it takes a great deal of time to look and to search.

This certainly applies to the metallics as well as -well, we see the time involved in getting the
pipeline as well as -- we see the involved as getting
the pipeline in.

As a result of this we see financial condition of the state of Alaska at the present time. We take a look at the operating budget. Nearly 50% in deficit. Take a look at the bonus money, 900 million dollars, practically gone.

This shows some of the things that can happen.

1	So I believe that timely you have to move ahead
2	and you never really have enough time to get these
3	things done.
4	MR. ROBERTSON:
5	We'll pause just a moment while we change this tape
6	(Whereupon a short off the record period was then
7	taken in the proceedings.
8	MR. DAVIES:
9	Mr. Beistline, we looked at this study in broader
10	context, as I mentioned earlier, and not just as
11	what the resource is on PET #4, but also what
12	might be in adjacent to it, and this falls right
13	with your comments of assessibility and metallics.
14	If, in fact, we are going to develop this soon, and
15	therefore need another corridor to get the oil
16	out, there is a possibility that perhaps we should
17	look in the western instead of the eastern part,
18	because you might make other resources assessible.
19	Would you comment on that?
20	MR. BEISTLINE:
21	Yes. In the west instead of the eastern part of
22	the reserve.
23	There is some indication of metallic deposits that
24	have been found. As I recall, it's gold, and there
25	is certainly some tungsten, and geologically there

1	MR.	WOODS:	
2			Would you favor having roads or some sort of a road
3			in that reserve, then?
4	MR.	BEISTL	INE:
5			Yes, I would. And when I say this, there are
6			certain restrictions that you may want to have.
7			Particularly if there are highways there, it should
8			be used by the people to further develop the
9			resources.
10	MR.	WOODS:	
11			Thank you very much, sir.
12	MR.	ROBERTS	SON:
13			Any further questions?
14			Thank you.
15			Do you have other nominations, Dr. Wood?
16	DR.	WOODS:	
17			Everyone back there.
18	MR.	ROBERTS	SON:
19			Could we hear from you, Dr. Woods?
20	DR.	WOODS:	
21			Why don't we see if anyone back there wants to.
22			I will definitely get up then.
23	MR.	ROBERTS	SON:
24			Who else would like to share their wisdom with us.
25			Please come forward.

MR. CRANDELL:

My name is Ace Crandell. I worked on the Slope four and a half years for various companies.

I studied geology in college.

But, at the same time, I'm an observer, and I think many people will be the same. The observer of wildlife.

Now, I never hunted in Alaska. I'm not a preservationist. I believe in utilization of all resources whether it is renewable or nonrenewable. It's the best for everybody.

My observation has been on the Slope, that the caribou herd, that they are decreased in numbers, are probably due to two items.

One, there is a restriction of hunting of wolf on the slope, and, two, the utilization of the snow mobiles in harvesting the animal in the wintertime. Now, I have noted many times a hunter will take out and, you know, they go thrity-five, forty miles an hour on a Ski-Doo. Now, if he is using a dog sled, a dog -- the speed, it determines -- it's deterined by the power of the dog or the strength of the dog.

The Ski-Doo, or land dogs they call up there, its distance is determined by the fuel supply and the

speed is determined by the man's foot. So there is -- if a man trots an animal, or a group of animals, he can run ten miles, twenty miles, to kill one, or kill a dozen. Now, if he is running dog team he may be able to slip around and get one, and the -- by doing that while the others escape, and they, in turn, will be hunted again by somebody else. But along the Slope, the native, he usually waited until the caribou came to him. They came along the shore line, that's where the people live, and that's when he hunted. He wouldn't go back in this cabin area like they are doing now. He would not go back into the foothills where he could hunt them in the wintertime. He may have utilized it some, but he depended mostly on the shoreline. His water orientated travel, the fish and the game of the ocean. So what I'm trying to say is, here we have a condition that has already taken place. Now, they are making an effort to rectify it, but

Now, they are making an effort to rectify it, but regardless how you are going to develop the resources in the area, you will have to have restrictions on utilization of renewable resources, and this is all they are coming for, and eventually they will

have to go back to the bow and arrow.

But I believe in utilizing the animal, but I also believe that if you are going to utilize it, you got to protect him some against his natural resources. And the migration patters of the caribou, odd as it is, is dependent mostly upon the instincts --of course, calfing instincts, but, then you only utilize -- that the area they calf is probably the during May, because the winds -- the air currents come up from the Bering Sea.

But also the little ole' misquito. He controls the movement of that caribou. I've seen whole herds, thousands, rush into the Arctic Ocean to get away from the misquito, because they go on the barrier reefs where there are no misquitos.

The reason why the misquito bothered them is the wind went down, and the misquito came out of the brush.

The movement of the caribou in the summertime when the misquito is out, is determined by the wind, too, definitely whether it is going or not.

If there is just a small wind, very little wind, well, he will try to go pretty rapid against the direction of the wind, toward the direction it is coming from, because that keeps the misquito off

his face.

If there is a harder wind, why, you might just kind of zigzag all around the country. But as everybody knows, the winds blow north and east and west or west and east most of the time.

But I thought I would put this input in because,
I know the natives in Alaska and some of the other
people along the Arctic Slope, well, they are going
to be worried about their hunting. Well, they have
a right to.

But at the same time, I believe that everybody in Alaska should have access to all resources of Alaska, and thereby, if you open it up, I can't afford to ride an airplane to the slope, or to the Arctic village, or any place like that to go hunting or fishing or trapping, but if I had a vehicle, and I got some friends to go in with me where we could drive up there, we would have access to it.

I mean, I really believe in having the availability the access for everybody, equal option to utilize public lands for hunting and fishing, prospecting, oil exploration, and I don't want to -- as I say, I understand the Tanana Chief's problems, but at the same time, I think since they have their land now, I think they got to determine if they are going

to control the trapping or hunting on their land, but any land that is federal land/state land, of course, it is free to be open for everybody, for equal opportunity.

So I would say that the utilization of the North Slope for the production of oil, well, everybody says it's a national interest; I believe it.

Why should we pay \$12.00 a barrel of oil overseas when we could get it here. Even if our companies will make a profit.

That is a lot better than sending \$12.00 over there and let the foreigners make a profit on a barrel when our own companies -- our own individuals would in Alaska.

No doubt the leasing program will be set up, so it will be competitive, and I would like to see it in small enough areas, small enough sections so a group of individuals here, I don't care who, they go together and they could lease maybe a section at a time. They could afford to lease a section, and at the same time, it can't be too small that it wouldn't be worthwhile to even drill a well. But that's about the size of it.

Any questions?

1	MR. ROBER	rson:
2		Questions from the panel?
3		Thank you for your statement.
4	UNKNOWN PE	ERSON:
5		Could you please state the address again to which
6		written testimony could be sent?
7	MR. ROBERT	SON:
8		Yes. Send it to Mr. Fred Chei, FEA Regional
9		Administrator for Alaska, Federal Energy
10		Administration, Room G-11, Federal Office Building
11		605 West Fourth Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska.
12		And we would like to get the statements as quickly
13		as we can because of the time schedule laid down
14		to us by Congress.
15	MR. REES:	
16		Mr. Chairman, if it is permissible, I would like
17		to answer or, at least amplify a little on a
18		question that a gentleman here left, asked of
19		Dr. Beistline.
20	MR. ROBERT	SON:
21	·	Please come forward. We would like to hear from
22		you.
23	MR. REES:	
24		This gentleman here touched on it just briefly, and
25		I think it is something that should be developed

started with a 900 million dollar project, it's now at 7 billion dollars plus. Who's going to pay it? The United States of America, et al, with the gas pumps, nobody else can.

And the bulk of the charges, I bet you will find are interest charges on all the equipment and all the stuff that was stockpiled starting in 1969 and just sat idle.

So it behooves us to develop within our own quarters as fast as we can every resource which will benefit the United States of America, which is one of the biggest manufacturing nations in the world, and needs a tremendous supply of natural resources to keep up our productivity, to keep up the level of employment and the standards of living that we must maintian, that we are used to maintaining, and used to having.

So in a simple answer, yes, development. And it is simple to have development if we know what the rules are.

So I hope that answers it.

You know, I read this statement that the environmentalist people put out and they want to hold off that development until the oil fields are exhausted. Well, you're not helping the bulk of

the people of the U. S., because you are again going to place the U. S. at the mercy of the Arab sheiks, and when you do that we've got trouble right here in River City.

MR. ROBERTSON:

Thank you.

I think I should probably explain. The panel itself is really, we want to hear from you people, and that is why we are not expressing any opinions of our own, because we want to really hear your opinions and hear you express your concerns and share your wisdom with us.

It doesn't mean we don't have an opinion, we certainly do.

MRS. WALTON:

I would like to comment on the incongruity of the Tanana Chiefs' position on the road, and back it up with an example.

They have gone on record as their Tanana Chiefs' meeting recently to close the road north, but I would like you, if you have the time, or their representatives here, to present a statement on how do they reconcile their own oil development, which they are now doing in the Kanbik (phonetic) area, they are building wells right now, and they have

built a winter road in there, and they are doing seismic work in there, and because of these millions of acres that they now -- they don't have title to, but they will -- they don't even have to make an environmental impact statement.

So, to me, some of these things should be reconciled in your mind. I can't reconcile it in my mind.

I'm certain that Dr. Beistline cannot reconcile it in his mind.

On the one hand they are against a road going in there, and at the very same time they have an outfit from Louisiana in there poking holes down right now, and they can't bring it in, which means they have to cut down trees, go across streams with no environmental impact concern whatever.

To me it is incongruous, and I would like you to address some of the boards of directors -- members of the board of directors in that outfit.

I think it might be an interesting aspect. It would sure be of interest to many of us.

MR. FINNIGAN:

First of all, the Tanana Chiefs Conference is a nonprofit organization and it does not involve the drilling anywhere.

1	MRS. WALTON:		
2	Doyan is their corporation.		
3	MR. FINNEGAN:		
4	Doyan is a profit making organization, and it is		
5	not represented here, and I think that anything		
6	you would want from Doyan you should contact the		
7	Doyan		
8	MRS. WALTON:		
9	I'm asking these gentlemen to ask them.		
10	MR. FINNEGAN:		
11	What I'm trying to do, Mrs. Walton, is explain the		
12	difference between the two organizations.		
13	MRS. WALTON:		
14	I know that.		
15	MR. FINNEGAN:		
16	You know, but these gentlemen don't. If the		
17	comment is asked from Doyan, rather than Tanana		
18	Chiefs, it could be answered more readily.		
19	Then it will be up to these gentlemen to decide in		
20	there is an emphasis.		
21	MRS. WALTON:		
22	Mr. Robertson, would you mind asking Doyan's		
23	board of directors, who is also elected by		
24	Tanana Chiofe the question T		

MR. FINNEGAN: 1 Well, that's what I'm saying. The organization that 2 is doing the developing is not the Tanana Chiefs 3 organization, which is a nonprofit organization. There are two distinct organizations. 5 There is some interlocking -- the membership is 6 identical, so the question should be directed to 7 Doyan, and perhaps, then, you gentlemen yourselves 8 could determine whether you feel it is inconsistent. 9 MRS. WALTON: 10 11 But you must agree that those men MR. FINNEGAN: 12 I think that is their decision. 13 MR. ROBERTSON: 14 Dr. Davies, do you have a question. 15 MR. DAVIES: 16 Mr. Rees and Dr. Beistline, my question was not 17 really an idle question. I would be concerned 18 with development. 19 There are many objectives we could try to achieve 20 on PET #4, and are familiar with, nothing by which 21 we could measure about how we could go about 22 doing that. 23

24

25

I appreciate your opinion that we should do it

rapidly, because this is, more or less, in keeping

with the objective of the project of independence, or independence of the country, while there are other objectives we might try to achieve, such as maximizing the revenues the government would achieve — ultimately receive from reserves, or possibly when I mentioned previously, in order to keep a steady flow of oil coming from its reserve, so as to maximize the utilization of the resource we already invested in the pipeline.

There are different objectives we could try to achieve in such a production from this reserve.

This is the reason why I was asking the opinion.

MR. BEISTLINE:

Yes. Well, again, I just believe that if action is necessary on as many fronts as possible, as soon as possible, and this, in turn, will allow the production to be the supply in demand to come in balance.

If you can go ahead now -- if you could develop and find what you have, then, certainly you may not produce, at the moment, if you have ample oil flowing to meet the needs.

But the oil is there, it is ready to go and production might well be needed. But if you wait until one field is practically gone, and then attempt

	łl	
1		to develop and find, you are just way behind the
2		eight ball.
3		I think that over the years experience has shown
4		us that we just have to keep moving as rapidly as
5		possible just to keep up and not fall back, and
6		as soon as we take a stand of no development status
7		quo, then we are falling back.
8		This is my feeling.
9	MR. ROBERT	TSON:
10		Thank you.
11		Dr. Gryc?
12	MR. GRYC:	
13		Mr. Chairman, I think it might good to allay Mr.
14		Rees' fear that this is an adversary procedure,
15		and
16	MR. REES:	
17		No, I didn't say that, I said I feel that
18	MR. GRYC:	
19		Oh, I see.
20		Well, I would like to point out that HR-49, that is
21		PET #4 bill, reserves to the Congress the right to
22		decide what is going to be done with PET #4, and the
23		report that will result from the FEA studies and
24		from a subsequent study that is required by the bill
25		will simply point out the alternatives, possible

impacts one way or the other and the Congress will

1

2

then

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

the wisest and the soundest use of the resources with which our land and our surrounding waters and our air above us have been in doubt.

I feel that it is man who provides a value added concept to whatever that resource base is. Whether it is renewable or nonrenewable.

I feel, too, that the endless discussions that I have found in developing nations around the world, that redistributing an existing well is completely phoney, because there is no instance in history where this has been accomplished to the benefit of a large percentage of the people in the area concerned.

You are going to have an improvement in the socio economic conditions and the cultural conditions, you must have a new well created, and you create a new well by bringing together the human resource and the natural resource. Again, whether it is renewable or nonrenewable.

Being an educationist and an educator for forty-five years, I feel that that is a catalyst. We have been misusing it for odds and ends, and we have poured out to strange gods in the educational field, and we have lost site of what it is that education can do, what its real role is in improvement of the

conditions for man.

You see, what I would talk about is largely philosophic and humanistic.

And when I heard today the comments that we just have to stop carrying out your assignment, which is basically to inventory the natural resources of the North Slope area, find out what they are, and the adjacent area. That's your basic assignment. These other things are peripheral. There is importance that should not be overlooked, but keep your eye upon the ball.

Let me give you an analogy. If you are playing golf and there is a dandilion, and if you take your eye off the ball when you are trying to drive, or to put -- in order to contemplate the dandelion, as much as you may love the thing, you are apt not to make a good drive.

That doesn't mean that you are going to crush the dandelion. It doesn't mean that you are not going to replace -- you are going to be concerned, otherwise you aren't going to have any place to play the second round if you tie up the first one.

But the basic assignment, as I understand it is, to make an inventory of the resource.

Now, down the line you have to provide some

suggestions as to how best, if we find something of value, can it be put into production at the benefit of the people of this nation, and to the people of the state of Alaska.

And I agree with those who have said that I think that the free enterprise group, private enterprise group, is going to get a better result than if you put it in the hands of government.

And again, I say this from a philosophic point of view.

I would observe that if all of the natural resources of a nation are -- or of a portion of that nation are in the hands of government, whether it is local, state or national, that the instance this becomes fact, that all of the human resources are also in the hands of government.

And we are back to where we were two hundred years ago, where the kings and the emporors owned all the land and the fish in the stream and the deer in the forest and all of my ancestors -- we are back to futilism, in other words.

To modify that, Dr. Beistline commented and Max

Brewer and others -- I would say, yes, there is a

role for government, but that role is not to attempt
to do all things for all people, to have the ultimate

plan of perfection, so that all of the potential woes that might be said any of us, as individual human beings, however remote we are from the seat of mighty, would be resolved. It is just utter damn nonsense.

You can't undertake to solve all problems for everybody in advance of knowing what the problems are, even if you knew government cannot solve all problems for all people.

And our government was created to make it possible for people, for individuals, for men and women, young and old, to take care of themselves.

Do we not have legislation and regulations which seems to take away the very freedoms which our government was founded to guarantee.

Ithought as I heard how -- the wonderful things we could learn during your exploration period. The launching of maybe a great liner (indiscernible), and I don't think that your purpose in carrying out your mission, that you are in a position to water it down by attempting to take on all the special interest that we could dream up.

I could talk to you about the music of the spheres and the wonders of the poetry of John Keatch, which happens to be my specialty, and I can tell you if

I am allowed to go up there funded by your project,
I could do some marvelous things in reinterpreting
Keatch.

It is not your assignment, and all I am asking here as a private citizen, retired, harmless, unemployed, for God's sake, keep your eye on the ball and get the inventory done as well as you can. And I would like, also, to caution you one final thing. That your inventory, no matter how well it is done, it will not be final.

I happened to be in Libia in 1955 as a guest of the Libian government, and of sixteen oil companies at the Waden Hotel, and that day it was announced the discovery of oil -- petroleum in Libia. The poorest nation in the world in 1955.

And I have just had the advantage of leafing through the thirty volume series of sceintific reports done by the scientists of Italy under the direction of Benicca Mussolini (phonetic), that concluded that there were no mineral resources of any sort in all of Libia.

So I want to suggest to you that there are advances in technology, there are advances in scientific knowledge, so long as we have free human beings in the world who can express their creativity and

WRITTEN TESTIMONY SUBMITTED

TO

FAIRBANKS OFFICE

- 1) MORGAN, H. Morris
- 2) STERN, Richard O.

Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. Doyon Building First and Hall Streets Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

April 9, 1976

Mr. Don Jean, Director
Energy Resources
Federal Energy Administration
Room G-11, Federal Office Building
605 West 4th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Dear Mr. Jean:

As per a verbal request yesterday at the Federal Energy Administration Conference in Fairbanks, we submit the following in answer to a question raised at the reading of the Tanana Chiefs Conference resolution regarding the haul road.

The question was: What village would be adversely affected by the opening of the haul road?

These villages are Minto, Manley Hot Springs, Rampart, Stevens Village, Allakaket, Alatna and Bettles-Evansville.

The haul road does not transect any village listed above, however, the movement of game has been disrupted by the traffic now using the haul road. We have much testimony from villages concerned with a diminishment of their traditional subsistence patterns.

The opening of the road would additionally put more pressure on the already decreasing wildlife of the region and cause hardship to the people who live there.

The question of consistency of the position of the Tanana Chiefs Conference and Doyon Corporation was raised at the Conference by an observer who was ignorant of the separate nature of the above organizations.

The Tanana Chiefs Conference is a non-profit social services organization which has no part in oil exploration. However, there is no opposition to resource inventory development and the position on the road is limited to general public use not to closing the road completely.

Thank you for the opportunity to make known our concerns.

Yours truly,

/s/ H.MORRIS MORGAN
Senior Planner
Tanana Chiefs Conference,
Inc.

(#3

HMM/cd

Institute of Arctic Biology Archeology Project

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA Fairbanks, Alaska 9 April 1976

FEA Deputy Regional Administrator for Alaska Federal Energy Administration Room G 11 Federal Office Building 605 West 4th Avenue Anchorage, Alaska

Dear Sir:

I wish to submit the following comments for consideration in the planning of mineral and oil/natural gas exploration and development in Naval Petroleum Reserve 4.

*

At the 'conference' held in Fairbanks, 8 April 1976, certain parties gave the impression in their statements that cultural resources (prehistoric and historic archeological sites) would not be found within PET 4 at any location except along the coast. This is not the case. Despite the limited archeological reconnaissance that has been undertaken within PET 4, the vast majority of the reserve has never been systematically examined for the presence of archeological resources. Personal experience in the region, and communications both published and unpublished from other archeologists indicate that

archeological resources exist within all portions of the region including the Arctic Coastal Plain and the head-waters of rivers within the Brooks Range.

*

In the exploration for natural resources, unfortunately it has been the case that exploration parties first in the area are often the first to discover and to damage archeological sites. Executive Order 11593, May 15, 1971 Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment. charges Federal agencies with the location and inventory of sites within their jurisdiction. To date such an inventory has not been undertaken for PET 4. To do so would be expensive and difficult. However, as part of the planning for natural resource exploration and development, it is less difficult. The management of the cultural resources within PET 4 must precede and coordinate with the development of the natural resources.

*

I strongly urge that the FEA use its authority and good offices to see that the archeological resources of PET 4 are properly managed during the course of natural resource exploration and development.

*

*

24

13

20

21

22

23

2	ation in conjunction with planning for the Alaskan gas
3	pipeline (see Iroquois Research Institute, a Study of
4	Archeological and Historic Potential Along the Trans-
5	Alaskan Natural Gas Pipeline Routes, Related to an Appli-
6	cation filed in Docket Number CP-75-96, et al, March 21,
7	1974). They may be able to offer advice with regard to
8	archeological management. In addition, BLM and NPS
9	are charged with protection of cultural resources and may
10	be able to clarify the responsibilities of the FEA with
11	regard to cultural resource management.
12	*
13	Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
14	
15	Sincerely yours,
16	RICHARD A. STERN (s)
17	
18	cc: Mr. Russell Cahill
19	Mr. Douglas Reger Mr. Curt Wilson
20	Mr. Thomas F. King Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
21	North Slope Native Regional Corporation Dr. Max Brewer
22	Federal Energy Administration, Washington, D.C.
23	

25

The FPC has recently undertaken an archeological evalu-